<center>**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</center>

In the Office Action mailed August 12, 2008, claims 1-12 were rejected. In response, Applicants have amended claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 and added new claims 13 and 14. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims, the new claims, and the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Werb et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,150,921, hereinafter Werb). Additionally, claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werb in view of Meier (EP 0805575, hereinafter Meier). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Werb and Meier for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites that a communication station "delivers a request signal to the transponder." Applicants assert that Werb does not disclose a communication station that delivers a request signal to the transponder as recited in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, the tag datagrams (1400, 1410, and 1420, see Figs. 12a – 12c) disclosed by Werb are sent from a tag (i.e., transponder) to a cell controller (i.e., communication station). See col. 12, lines 23 – 36 and col. 13, lines 50 – 51. Because the tag datagrams disclosed by Werb are sent from a tag (i.e., transponder) to a cell controller (i.e., communication station), Werb does not disclose a request signal, having a command block and a check data block, which is delivered from a communication station (i.e., a cell controller) to a transponder (i.e., a tag) as recited in claim 1. Further, Werb does not disclose that data contained in the tag datagrams is evaluated in the tag (i.e., transponder) in order to recognize whether the tag (i.e., transponder) belongs to a group of tags (i.e., transponders). Given that Werb does not disclose every element of claim 1, Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Werb.

Additionally, claim 1 recites:

> "wherein, for each group of transponders, a check data block that is significant for the group of transponders is generated, and
>> wherein the data that is evaluated for the recognition of whether the transponder belongs to a group of transponders is data from the check data block that is significant for the group of transponders."

That is, claim 1 recites that a check data block in a request signal is used to determine if a transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.

Werb discloses that tags may be grouped based on their unique identity code (UID), see col. 13, line 67. However, grouping tags based on their unique identity code does not disclose determining whether or not a transponder (i.e., tag) belongs to a particular group of transponders based on a check data block. That is, determining whether or not a transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders based on the unique identity code of the transponder is not the same as determining whether or not a transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders based on a check data block. Because Werb does not disclose determining whether or not a transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders based on a check data block, Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Werb.

Claims 2 – 12

Claims 2 – 12 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 – 12 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, each of claims 4, 6, 9, 9, 11, and 12 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claims 4, 6, 8, and 11 have been amended to particularly point out that the start values are "group-significant" start values and to particularly point out that each of the different group-significant start values are "assigned to a different group of transponders." Support for the amendments is found in Applicants' specification at, for example, paragraph [0036].

The limitations of claims 4, 6, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the Office action cites Meier as teaching the limitations of these claims. Applicants assert that Meier does not teach group-significant start values that are each assigned to a

different group of transponders as recited in the amended claims. At page 4, lines 36 –
43, Meier teaches that start values of a CRC generator can be programmed. However,
nowhere does Meier teach or suggest that the start values should be programmed as
<u>group-significant</u> start values that are each <u>assigned to a different group of transponders</u>
as recited in amended claim 4, 6, 8, and 11. Because Meier does not teach or suggest that
the start values of the CRC generator should be group-significant start values that are
each assigned to a different group of transponders, Applicants assert that amended claims
4, 6, 8, and 11 are patentable over Werb in view of Meier.

Claims 9 and 12 have been amended to particularly point out that the start values
are "group-significant" start values. Support for the amendments is found in Applicants'
specification at, for example, paragraph [0036]. The limitations of claims 9 and 12 are
rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the Office action cites Meier as teaching the
limitations of these claims. Applicants assert that Meier does not teach group-significant
start values as recited in amended claims 9 and 12. At page 4, lines 36 – 43, Meier
teaches that start values of a CRC generator can be programmed. However, nowhere
does Meier teach or suggest that the start values should be programmed as group-
significant start values. Because Meier does not teach or suggest that the start values of
the CRC generator should be group-significant start values, Applicants assert that
amended claims 4, 6, 8, and 11 are patentable over Werb in view of Meier.

New Claims 13 and 14

New claim 13 recites in part that "the check data block contains a set of error
correction data that is used both for error correction at the transponder and to determine
whether the transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders." Support for new
claim 13 is found in Applicants' specification at, for example, paragraphs [0056] and
[0065]. Applicants assert that the limitations of new claim 14 are not taught or suggested
by the Werb or Meier.

New claim 14 recites in part that the "transponders process the command data
block only if evaluation of the check data block of the request signal indicates that the
transponder belongs to the group of transponders that is identified by the check data
block." Support for new claim 14 is found in Applicants' specification at, for example,

paragraph [0065]. Applicants assert that the limitations of new claim 14 are not taught or suggested by the Werb or Meier.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claims, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 11, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111